

III. REMARKS

By this amendment, claim 13 has been amended and claims. Claims 13-24 remain pending in this application. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the objections and rejections and reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,848,396 (Gerace) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,078,916 (Cantrell). Since the combination, if proper, of Gerace and Culliss fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention as required by 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

For example, with respect to newly amended claim 13, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, that every data item identifies an individual marketed product and has only marketing content for the marketed product for displaying on the web page. This limitation is supported by page 7, final sentence. Applicants acknowledge the ruling of the board with regard to the inclusion of marketing content within a data item. However, the decision does not extend to every data item being associated with a single marketed product and containing only information pertaining thereto. Furthermore, none of the cited references teaches or suggests this feature. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With further respect to independent claim 13, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references also fail to teach or suggest storing said data items in one of a plurality of marketing page elements, every marketing page element being of a different type, according to a mode for conveying information to a user and providing a framework for the data items. This limitation is supported by page 1, second paragraph, and pages 15-18 in the specification (showing separate types of MPEs according to delivery strategy). This amendment also satisfies the Office's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

IV. CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/

Date: September 30, 2008

Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)